The Court finds that counsel's rate of \$225 is reasonable based on counsel's experience and the relief obtained for Plaintiffs. *See Benton v. Oregon Student Assist. Comm'n*, 421 F.3d 901, 904–05 (9th Cir. 2005). However, the Court's order allowed for fees arising only from the *enforcement* of the settlement agreement, not its drafting or negotiation. (Dkt. No. 134, at 5.) The Plaintiffs' current request for \$5,625 in fees exceeds the scope of that order. Specifically, the declaration submitted by Plaintiffs' counsel contains five entries from April 1 to May 30, 2005, in which the work performed is clearly directed to the creation of and revisions to the settlement agreement—preceding any efforts to enforce the agreement. (*See* Brown Decl. 2.) Notwithstanding Plaintiffs' contention that those fees were incurred "negotiating terms in an effort to avoid" their enforcement motion, the Court will deduct those five entries, totaling 5.8 hours or \$1,305. The Court finds the remaining balance of 19.2 hours is reasonable, and accordingly awards the Plaintiffs a total of \$4,320 in attorneys fees.

Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion IN PART, and ORDERS that Defendant Channel Lending pay Plaintiffs \$4,320 in attorneys fees in addition to the \$89,227 required by the Court's September 27 order. In the event Defendant Channel Lending has not already made the payment required under that order, it shall pay Plaintiffs the updated total of \$93,547.00 within ten days of the date of this order.

SO ORDERED this 27th day of October, 2005.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

de C Copina

26 ORDER – 2